The REVOLUTION of 1905

BY

V. I. LENIN

LONDON
MARTIN LAWRENCE LIMITED

IN THE LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

Already issued in this series of writings by V. I. Lenin

THE TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX
THE WAR AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALISM AND WAR
WHAT IS TO BE DONE?
THE PARIS COMMUNE
THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

In Preparation

STATE AND REVOLUTION
IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM
LETTERS FROM AFAR
TWO TACTICS IN THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
ON RELIGION
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM
THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY, etc., etc.

Printed in Great Britain
at the BURLEIGH PRESS, *Lewin's Mead*, BRISTOL

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE present volume contains several articles and a speech by Lenin, which give a comprehensive view of the Revolution of 1905. This revolution was later, in 1917, characterised by the greatest leader of the revolutionary proletariat in the world, as the " dress rehearsal" of the October Revolution. And in this undoubtedly lies its lasting historical significance. But the 1905 Revolution is not merely of historical interest; it is of immediate interest from the standpoint of the proletarian struggles of our own day throughout the world. One characteristic feature of the development of the world proletarian revolution as a single process is that, simultaneously with the proletarian revolutions that are maturing in the most advanced imperialist countries, bourgeois revolutions are proceeding in the principal colonial countries. For these the 1905 Revolution also represents a " dress rehearsal," in the strictest sense of the term. We have in mind especially the development of the mighty struggle for emancipation waged by the masses of workers and peasants of China and India and by the oppressed colonial peoples of the Near East. The struggle of oppressed colonial lands for emancipation from imperialism represents an integral part of the world proletarian revolution, or, to put it more precisely, the proletariat of the world is coming to the fore, in the process of development of the world revolution, as the leader of hundreds of millions of peasants in the colonial countries. Because of this circumstance, the 1905 Revolution may be called the dress rehearsal not only of October, 1917, but of the World October. Surely Lenin had this in mind when he said that the 1905 Revolution was a prelude to the proletarian revolution in Europe, and emphasized the mighty influence it has had throughout Asia.

For these reasons a correct understanding of the revolutionary policy of Marxism-Leninism is essential, and it is necessary to study the character and content of the 1905 Revolution and its driving forces.

The mobilisation of the different classes and parties in the 1905 Revolution, the methods and forms of their struggle against one

another, the wave-like course of the revolutionary action, the creative power developed by the millions of exploited people in town and country as they were brought into the revolutionary swell, the class-consciousness, determination and high degree of organisation of the proletariat as the vanguard of the oppressed peasant masses, the purposeful leadership of the revolutionary working class by the Bolshevik Party—these are the most striking features of the analysis of the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution, which deserve special attention. At this point it is necessary to be clear in regard to the peculiar character of the bourgeois Revolution of 1905 : despite the bourgeois character and content of the revolution, the proletariat alone represented the " driving force," the vanguard of the movement, and it applied the weapon of the political and economic strike as the chief means for arousing the peasant masses. Therefore, Lenin says that the Russian Revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois-democratic revolution in social content, but proletarian in driving force and in the means of struggle which were applied.

This fundamental conception of the Bolsheviks regarding the nature and driving force of the revolution, was diametrically opposed to the Mensheviks' conceptions as well as to Trotsky's eclectic theory of " permanent revolution." The Mensheviks were of the opinion that the proletariat could only play a secondary role in the bourgeois revolution and therefore argued that its task was merely " to drive the bourgeoisie forward " in its hostility to absolutism. Obviously, such tactics must have resulted in the proletariat lagging in the rear; the Mensheviks entirely misunderstood and even overlooked the fundamental task of the revolution, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the peasantry and hence disregarded the necessity for stimulating the peasants' agrarian revolution against feudalism. On the other hand, Trotsky, who had never had a definite conception of the nature of the bourgeois Revolution of 1905, for this reason reached a point, in his theory of " permanent revolution," when he denied the possibility of the revolutionary alliance between proletariat and peasantry and also proclaimed a " workers' government " to be the immediate aim of the revolutionary uprising. And to this he "logically" attached the conception that "without direct and governmental aid from the European proletariat the working class of Russia could not maintain itself in power " (*Our Revolution*, p. 278, Russian).

In sharp contrast to both these Menshevik conceptions, the

Bolsheviks, on the basis of their Marxian analysis, declared the strategic aim of the Revolution of 1905 to be the complete destruction of absolutism, to "carry the bourgeois revolution to completion," and set up as its formulation the classic slogan of the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." Above all, this formula was intended to present with absolute clarity the mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry in their united revolutionary struggle against Tsarism and for the democratic republic. It was intended to emphasize the necessity of establishing a truly revolutionary provisional government, excluding the cowardly bourgeoisie with their spirit of compromise. In a very bitter controversy with the Mensheviks, Lenin worked out the conception that instead of the driving force of the revolutionary development being weakened by the desertion of the bourgeoisie to the side of reaction, it would, on the contrary, be strengthened to a considerable degree. The idea that it was possible and necessary for the Social-Democratic party to take part in the provisional revolutionary government, precisely for the purpose of carrying the bourgeois revolution through to completion, was based on the task of the proletariat, to establish its hegemony over the masses of the peasantry.

But the question of the nature and driving force of the revolution and of its strategic aim was not the only point of difference between the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks; the problems and tasks of revolutionary tactics and organisation sharply divided them too; and in the heat of the revolutionary struggles Leninism was, for the first time, proven to be right. It is particularly important, therefore, to study correctly and understand Lenin's explanations of the significance of economic and political mass strikes in rousing the masses to revolutionary action, in bringing forward the proletariat as the leader of the exploited peasantry, and in linking up the political general strike with the highest form of proletarian activity, which under certain conditions develops out of it.

The speech on the 1905 Revolution and the article, "The Lessons of the Moscow Uprising," provide abundant material for studying the questions of organising the revolution, in the strictest sense of the word. In this respect we cannot help admiring the skill in which Lenin feels the pulse of the revolutionary movement and sums up its most important inner connections. The transition of the different forms of the revolutionary struggle from one into another, the creative achievement of the masses themselves in "discovering" these new

forms as well as in organising the corresponding bodies, especially the Soviets, in order to turn these forms of struggle into real forces, are prime factors of the revolutionary struggle.

The systematic and conscious unification of these activities, of these forms and organs of struggle by the Bolshevik Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, is another vital point; and the Leninist analysis and synthesis transforms all these factors of the revolutionary process into a "guide for the practical activity" of the proletariat. To have this guide well in hand, in every concrete situation to seize upon the most vital link of the chain, to keep firmly to the course, once the strategic goal is set, and thus to make no leaps into the azure heights of abstract concepts and away from reality—that is the art of Marxism-Leninism. This little volume may serve as a contribution to the study of revolutionary policy, which forms an integral part of historical materialism.

. . . . . .

The material in this volume has been compiled not only in chronological order but also according to the theme. It gives a plain survey of the objective course of the revolutionary events, as well as an account of the theoretical and practical conclusions which the Bolshevik Party drew from them and applied. The unity of theory and practice—revolutionary theory is converted into material power if the masses are inspired by it—this truth can, with full justice, serve as the motto of this little volume on the 1905 Revolution.

I

THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

GENEVA.
Wednesday, January 25.

MOST important historic events are taking place in Russia. The proletariat has risen against Tsarism. The proletariat has been driven to the uprising by the Government. Now there is hardly room for doubt that the Government deliberately allowed the strike movement to develop and a wide demonstration to be started in order to bring matters to a head, and to have a pretext for calling out the military forces. Its manœuvre was successful! Thousands of killed and wounded—this is the toll of Bloody Sunday, January 22, in Petersburg. The army vanquished unarmed workers, women and children. The army overpowered the enemy by shooting prostrate workers. "We have taught them a good lesson!" cynically say the Tsar's henchmen and their European flunkeys, the conservative bourgeoisie.

Yes, it was a great lesson! The Russian proletariat will not forget this lesson. The most uneducated, the most backward strata of the working class, who had naively trusted the Tsar and had sincerely wished to put peacefully before "the Tsar himself" the requests of a tormented nation, were all taught a lesson by the military force led by the Tsar and the Tsar's uncle, the Grand Duke Vladimir.

The working class had received a great lesson in civil war; the revolutionary education of the proletariat advanced in one day further than it could have advanced in months and years of drab, everyday, stupefied existence. The slogan of the heroic Petersburg proletariat, "liberty or death!" rings like an echo throughout the whole of Russia. Events are developing with marvellous speed. The general strike in Petersburg is spreading. All industrial, social and political life is paralysed. On Monday, January 23, the encounters between the workers and the military become more stubborn. Contrary to the false Government *communiqués*, blood is spilt in many parts of the capital. The Kolpino workers are rising. The

proletariat is arming itself and the people. There are rumours that the workers have seized the Sestroretsk Arsenal. The workers are supplying themselves with revolvers, they are forging their tools into weapons, they are procuring bombs for a desperate fight for freedom. The general strike is spreading to the provinces. In Moscow 10,000 people have already ceased work. A general strike is to be called in Moscow to-morrow (Thursday, January 26). A revolt has broken out in Riga. The workers in Lodz are demonstrating, an uprising is being prepared in Warsaw, demonstrations of the proletariat are taking place in Helsingfors. In Baku, Odessa, Kiev, Kharkov, Kovno and Vilno, there is growing ferment among the workers and the strike is spreading. In Sebastopol the stores and arsenals of the navy department are ablaze, and the troops refuse to shoot on the rebellious sailors. There are strikes in Reval and in Saratov. In Radom, an armed encounter occurred between the workers and a detachment of reserves which had been called out.

The revolution is spreading. The government is already beginning to waver. From a policy of bloody repression it is trying to pass to economic concessions and to save itself by throwing a sop, by promising the nine-hour day. But the lesson of Bloody Sunday must not be forgotten. The demand of the rebellious Petersburg workers—the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal, direct, equal and secret suffrage—must become the demand of all the striking workers. The immediate overthrow of the Government—such was the slogan raised in answer to the massacre of January 9, even by those Petersburg workers who believed in the Tsar; they raised this slogan through their leader, George Gapon,* who said after that bloody day: "We no longer have a Tsar. A river of blood separates the Tsar from the nation. Long live the fight for freedom!"

Long live the revolutionary proletariat! say we. The general strike is rousing and mobilising larger and larger masses of the working class and of the city poor. The arming of the people is becoming one of the immediate problems of the revolutionary moment.

* Father Gapon (1870-1906), at the suggestion of Zubatov, chief of the political police, formed reactionary workers' circles (1902-1903). With Plehve's aid he obtained permission to organise the St. Petersburg Association of Russian Factory Workers, subsidised by the secret police. With the idea of presenting a workers' petition to the Tsar, Gapon became involved on the side of the workers against the management of the Putilov works; these workers were at the head of the St. Petersburg general strike. A favourable opportunity for a mass movement and a workers' demonstration in the streets presented itself, and this led to the events of January 22.

After "Bloody Sunday" Gapon fled abroad, and, attempting to identify himself with one of the political parties, carried on negotiations with Lenin, Plekhanov, the Social-Revolutionaries, and others. On his return to Russia he renewed his connection with the police department, but after his treacherous rôle became apparent he was killed by Social-Revolutionaries in April, 1906.—*Ed.*

Only an armed people can be a real stronghold of national freedom. And the sooner the proletariat succeeds in arming itself, and the longer it maintains its martial position of striker and revolutionary, the sooner will the army begin to waver, the soldiers will at last begin to understand what they are doing, they will go over to the side of the people against the monsters, against the tyrants, against the murderers of defenceless workers and of their wives and children. No matter what the outcome of the present uprising in Petersburg will be, it will, in any case, be the first step to a wider, more conscious, better prepared uprising. The government may perhaps succeed in putting off the day of reckoning, but the postponement will only make the next step of the revolutionary attack more powerful. Social-Democracy will take advantage of this postponement in order to close the ranks of the organised fighters, and to spread the news about the start made by the Petersburg workers. The proletariat will join in the fight, will desert mill and factory, and prepare arms for itself. Into the midst of the city poor, to the millions of peasants, the slogans of the struggle for freedom will be carried more and more effectively. Revolutionary committees will be formed in every factory, in every section of the city, in every village. The people in revolt will overthrow all the government institutions of the Tsarist autocracy and proclaim the immediate convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

The immediate arming of the workers and of all citizens in general, the preparation and organisation of the revolutionary forces for annihilating the Government authorities and institutions—this is the practical basis on which all revolutionaries can, and must unite, to strike a common blow. The proletariat must always go its independent way in close contact with the Social-Democrat party, always bearing in mind its great final goal, the goal of ridding mankind of all exploitation. But this independence of the Social-Democratic proletarian party will never cause us to forget the importance of a common revolutionary attack at the moment of actual revolution. We Social-Democrats can and must proceed independently of the revolutionaries of the bourgeois democracy, and guard the class independence of the proletariat. But we must go hand in hand with them in an uprising when direct blows are being struck at Tsarism, when resisting the troops, when attacking the Bastille of the accursed enemy of the entire Russian people.

The eyes of the proletariat of the whole world are anxiously turned towards the proletariat of all Russia. The overthrow of Tsarism in

Russia, started so valiantly by our working class, will be the turning-point in the history of all countries, will make easier the task of the workers of all nations, in all states, in all parts of the globe. Therefore, let every Social-Democrat, let every class-conscious worker remember the great tasks of the all-national struggle that now rest on his shoulders. Let him not forget that he represents the needs and the interests of the entire peasantry too, of the entire mass of the toiling and exploited, of the entire people against the all-national enemy. The whole world is watching the example of the heroic proletarians of St. Petersburg.

Long live the Revolution!

Long live the proletariat in revolt!

Vperyod, No. 4, January 31, 1905.*

II

THE REVOLUTIONARY-DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE PEASANTRY

THE question as to whether Social-Democracy should take part in a provisional revolutionary government has been brought up, not so much by the actual course of events, as by the theoretical arguments of the Social-Democrats of a certain tendency. In two pamphlets (No. 13 and No. 14) we have dealt with the reflexions advanced by Martynov,† the first to bring up this question. It appears, however, that the interest in it is so great and the misunderstandings to which these arguments have given birth are so tremendous (see especially No. 93 of *Iskra*‡) that it is essential to pause once more over this question. No matter how Social-Democrats may appraise the probability of our having to solve this question in the near future and not merely in a theoretical way, in any case, clarity on its immediate purposes is essential to the party. Without a plain answer to this

* The *Vperyod* (*Forward*) was the first Bolshevik paper. It appeared weekly in Geneva, 1905. Lenin was the chief editor.—*Ed.*

† Martynov (born 1865) participated in the revolutionary movement from the late 'eighties, was a leader of the tendency known as "economism" at the end of the century, and then one of the leaders of the Mensheviks, joined the Communist Party in 1922 and is now one of the editors of *The Communist International*.—*Ed.*

‡ The *Iskra* (*Spark*) was in 1900-1903 the organ of Russian Social-Democracy, under Lenin's direction. After the Second Congress (1903) it passed into the hands of the Mensheviks.—*Ed.*

question it is impossible to have even any, a thorough-going propaganda and agitation, free of waverings and reservations.

Let us try to get back to the essence of the question in dispute. If we wish not only concessions on the part of the autocracy, but its actual downfall, then we must strive to have the imperial Government replaced by a provisional revolutionary Government, which should summon a Constituent Assembly on the basis of truly universal, direct and equal suffrage, with secret ballot, and which should be capable of maintaining complete liberty during the period of elections. And at this point we are asked whether it is permissible for the Social-Democratic Labour Party to participate in a provisional revolutionary Government of this sort? This question was first raised by the representatives of the opportunist wing of our party, namely by Martynov, even before the 9th of January; Martynov, and after him *Iskra*, gave a negative answer to the question. Martynov tried to reduce to an absurdity the views of the revolutionary Social-Democrats, by attempting to frighten them with the idea that in case of successful work in organising the revolution, in case an armed popular insurrection should be conducted by our party, we should *have* to participate in the provisional revolutionary government. But such participation is an inadmissible " seizure of power," it is, for a Social-Democratic class party, inadmissible " vulgar Jauresism."*

Let us pause a moment over the arguments of those who uphold this view. If it is in the provisional government, they tell us, Social-Democracy will hold power in its hands ; but Social-Democracy as the party of the proletariat, cannot keep power in its hands without attempting to realise our maximum programme, that is, without trying to bring about the Socialist revolution. But in such an enterprise it is bound at the present time to suffer defeat and would only cover itself with shame, and play into the hands of the reaction. Therefore, they say the participation of Social-Democracy in the provisional revolutionary government is inadmissible.

This argument is based on the confusion of the democratic and the Socialist revolutions—of the struggle for the republic (including in this our minimum programme in its entirety) and the struggle for Socialism. If it attempted to set as its immediate aim the Socialist revolution, Social-Democracy would in fact simply cover itself with

* An expression used by Martov, a Menshevik leader, referring to the policy supported by Jaures the French Socialist leader of Socialists joining capitalist governments. At the end of last century Millerand, at that time a Socialist, entered the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet.—*Ed.*

shame. It is just against such obscure and confused ideas among our "Socialist Revolutionaries" that Social-Democracy has always fought. And it is for that very reason that it has always insisted on the bourgeois character of the revolution which Russia is now facing, and sternly demanded the separation of the democratic minimum programme from the socialist maximum programme. This may be forgotten at the time of the revolution by various Social-Democrats, inclined to yield to the elemental force of the movement, but not by the party as a whole. The partisans of this mistaken opinion tend to worship elemental force, to believe that the march of things would compel Social-Democracy, under such circumstances, against its will to set about realising the Socialist revolution. If that were so, then it would mean that our programme was wrong, that it would no longer be adequate for the "march of things": this is just what these worshippers of elemental force are afraid of, they are afraid our programme is correct. But their fear (the psychological explanation of which we have tried to sketch in our pamphlets) is groundless to the last degree. Our programme is right. And it is the march of things that will certainly confirm it, and the farther they march, the more they will confirm it. And the course of events binds on us the absolute necessity of fighting desperately for the republic; in the practical sense it is directing our forces to that aim, the forces of the politically active proletariat. It is precisely the course of things which, in case of the democratic revolution, will inevitably bind upon us such a mass of allies from among the lower bourgeoisie and peasantry, whose real needs will demand merely the execution of the minimum programme, that fears of too quick a transition to our maximum programme are quite ridiculous.

But, on the other hand, it is just these allies from the lower middle-class democratic elements who inspire new fears among the Social-Democrats of a certain tendency, namely fears as to "vulgar Jauresism." Participation in the government, together with bourgeois democracy, is forbidden by a resolution of the Amsterdam Congress *; that is Jauresism, that is, un-class-conscious betrayal of the interests of the proletariat, corruption of the proletariat into a mere hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, debauchment of it by the tinsel show of power, which in fact remains absolutely unattainable for it under bourgeois society.

This argument is not less mistaken. It shows that its authors

* This resolution of the Amsterdam Congress of the Second International (1904).—*Ed.*

have learned by rote some good resolutions, but have not grasped their meaning; they have crammed several clever expressions directed against the Jauresists, but they have not thought them over and therefore apply them quite inappropriately; they have taken the word but not the spirit of the latest teachings of international revolutionary Social-Democracy. Anyone who wishes to appraise Jauresism, from the point of view of dialectic materialism, must separate strictly the subjective motives and the objective historical conditions. Subjectively speaking, Jaures wished to save the republic by entering for this purpose into alliance with bourgeois democracy. The objective conditions of this "experiment" were that the republic in France was already a fact and was not threatened by any serious danger; that the working class was fully able to develop its own independent class political organisation and failed to take sufficient advantage of this possibility, partly under the influence of the abundance of its leaders' tinselly parliamentary exercises; that, in fact, history had already faced the working class with the tasks of the Socialist revolution, from which the proletariat was *lured away* by the Millerands through the promise of tiny social reforms.

Now, take Russia, for example. Subjectively speaking, the revolutionary Social Democrats, like the *Vperyod* group or Parvus,* want to fight to the last ditch for the republic, with this purpose entering into alliance with revolutionary bourgeois democracy. The objective conditions are as different from the French ones as heaven from earth. Objectively speaking, the historical course of things has now set the Russian proletariat the task of securing the democratic bourgeois revolution (all its contents we denote for brevity by the word "republic"); this task faces the entire people, that is, the entire mass of lower bourgeoisie and peasantry; without this revolution it is useless to think about any sweeping development whatever of an independent class organisation in preparation for the Socialist revolution.

Just imagine all the difference in objective circumstances and say: what must we think of people who forget this difference, and let themselves be fascinated by the resemblance of a few words, the likeness of a few letters, the identity of the subjective motivation?

Since Jaures in France bowed down to worship bourgeois social

* Parvus (Helphand, 1869-1924), at first an outstanding Social-Democrat and Marxist theoretician, as an emigré was active in the 'nineties in the German Social Democracy, returned to Russia in 1905 and took part in the revolution. He held with Trotsky the theory of "permanent revolution." During the World War became extreme chauvinist and a direct agent of German imperialism.—*Ed.*

reform, incorrectly covering up his true self by the subjective purpose of the struggle for the republic, then we Russian Social-Democrats must renounce serious struggle for the republic! But it is to this, and only this that the wisdom of the new *Iskra* group amounts to.

As a matter of fact, is it not clear that the fight for the republic is unthinkable for the proletariat without its being allied with the petty bourgeois mass of the people? Is it not clear that without the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry there is not a shadow of hope for success in this struggle? One of the chief defects of the view under discussion is its deadness, its triteness, in that it loses sight of the conditions dominating a revolutionary period. To fight for a republic and at the same time renounce the revolutionary democratic dictatorship is the same as if Oyama had decided to fight Kuropatkin outside Mukden, having first of all given up the idea of entering Mukden. But if we, the revolutionary people, that is, the proletariat and peasantry, wish to beat the autocracy all together, then we must all beat it good and hard, beat it to death, and then beat off the inevitable attempts to restore it! (Let us again state explicitly, to avoid possible misunderstandings, that we mean by republic not so much the form of government as a whole complex of democratic reforms contained in our minimum programme.)

One must possess a truly schoolboy understanding of history to imagine the business without "jumps," in the form of a slowly and systematically ascending straight line: in the beginning the turn would fall to the upper bourgeoisie, little concessions made by the autocracy, then the turn of the revolutionary lower middle-class with the democratic republic, and finally the proletariat and the Socialist revolution. This picture is true in general and in its entirety, it is true in the long run, over a century or so (for example for France from 1789 till 1905), but in order to draw up according to this picture the plan for one's own activity during a revolutionary epoch one must be a virtuoso of philistinism. If the Russian autocracy is not able to get out of its difficulties now by a bob-tail constitution, if it is not only shaken but actually overthrown, then, evidently, a tremendous exertion of revolutionary energy by all the progressive masses will be needed in order to defend this conquest. But this defending it is nothing else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry! The more we conquer now, the more energetically we defend what we have conquered, the less can be taken away afterwards by the inevitable reaction in the future, the

shorter these intervals of reaction will be, the easier will be the task of the proletarian fighters who follow us.

But then certain people make their appearance, who wish beforehand, before the fight, to measure off with a tape-measure, " Ilovaisky-fashion,"* a modest little slice of the future conquests ; before the fall of the autocracy, even before the 9th of January, they took it into their heads to frighten the working class of Russia with the scarecrow of the awful revolutionary democratic dictatorship ! And these tape-measure people lay claim to the name of revolutionary Social Democrats. . . .

To take part in the Provisional Government together with the bourgeois revolutionary democracy—they weep—means giving our blessing to the bourgeois society, to the conservation of prisons and police, unemployment and need, private property and prostitution. This is a deduction worthy of anarchists or of the Narodniks. Social-Democracy does not turn its back on the struggle for political freedom on the ground that that is bourgeois political freedom. Social-Democracy looks from the historical point of view on the so-called " giving a blessing " to the bourgeois order. When Feuerbach was asked whether he gave his blessing to the materialism of Buchner, Vogt and Moleschott, he replied: " I give my blessing to materialism in its relation to the past, not to the future." That is exactly in what sense the Social-Democrats give their blessing to the bourgeois order. It has never feared and will never fear to say that it gives its blessing to the republican, democratic bourgeois order in comparison with the monarchical, serf-holding bourgeois order. But it " gives its blessing " to the bourgeois republic merely as to the last form of class rule, it praises it as the most suitable arena for the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, it blesses it not for its prisons and police, for private property and prostitution, but for the sweeping and free struggle against these pleasant institutions.

Of course, we are far removed from the idea of asserting that participation in the provisional revolutionary Government will not bring with it any dangers for Social-Democracy. There cannot be any form of struggle, any political situation which does not bring dangers with it. If the revolutionary class instinct is lacking, if an all-round philosophical outlook, on a level with one's learning, is lacking, if there is no " Tsar " at the head (let this be said without

* Ilovaisky (1832-1920) was a reactionary professor of history, author of a textbook so stupidly patriotic that his ignorance has become proverbial.—*Ed.*

anger to the comrades in the new *Iskra* group), then it is dangerous to take part in strikes—it may lead to economism, the exclusive emphasis on the economic struggle—or to take part in the parliamentary struggle—it may end in parliamentary idiocy—or to support the liberal democracy of the Zemstvos (provincial self-governing bodies)—it may lead to the "plan for the Zemstvo campaign."* In that case it is dangerous to read on the history of the French Revolution the most useful works of Jaures and Aulard—it may lead to Martynov's pamphlet on the two dictatorships.†

It stands to reason that if Social-Democracy even for a minute forgot the class separateness of the proletariat as against the lower bourgeoisie, if it concluded at the inopportune moment an alliance unprofitable for us with one or another untrustworthy party, made up of lower bourgeois intelligentsia, if Social-Democracy for a single minute lost sight of its own independent aims and the necessity (in every political situation at every political turn and overturn) to concentrate its attention on developing the class-consciousness of the proletariat and its independent political organisation—in that case participation in the provisional revolutionary government would be extremely dangerous. But under such circumstances, we repeat, any political step whatever would be equally dangerous. How baseless it is to time these possible fears to the present state of the immediate tasks of revolutionary Social-Democracy, will be clear to all from the simplest references. We won't speak of ourselves, we won't begin to reproduce the numerous declarations, warnings, instructions published in the *Vperyod* on the question we are discussing—we shall merely refer to Parvus. In coming out in favour of participation by Social-Democracy in the provisional revolutionary government, he emphasises with all his might the conditions which we must never forget: to strike together, to go our own way, not to mix up our organisations, to keep an eye on our ally as if on an enemy, etc. We shall not pause any longer on this side of the matter, since it has been outlined in the pamphlet.

No, the real political danger by no means lies at the present time in the place where the new *Iskra* group is looking for it. It is not the

* The Zemstvos were the provincial assembly, in which the landed proprietors and the bourgeoisie predominated. In 1904 they put forth a liberal campaign by petition, containing timid demands for a constitution. The Menshevik editors of the *Iskra* worked out a plan for support of this liberal campaign, and advised the party organisations to "intimidate" the liberal members of the Zemstvos by revolutionary actions.—*Ed.*

† Martynov's pamphlet, *Two Dictatorships*, "showed definitely," as the *Iskra* put it, "that it is impossible for Russian Social-Democracy to play the part of Jacobin Party in the present revolution," *i.e.*, to be the most extreme party in the revolution.—*Ed.*

idea of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry that must terrify us, but that spirit of khvostism* and deadness which acts to decompose the party of the proletariat and expresses itself in every possible kind of theory of " organisation process," "arming process," etc. Take, for example, the latest attempt of *Iskra* to draw the distinction between the provisional revolutionary government and the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Is that not a model of dead scholasticism ? The people who compose such distinctions are capable of stringing beautiful words together, but quite incapable of thought. The relation between these two concepts is approximately that between the juridical form and the class content. When you say " provisional revolutionary government," you are stressing the legal-juridical side of the matter, the origin of the government not in law but in revolution, the provisional character of a government which is bound by the future constituent assembly. But whatever its form may be, whatever its origin, whatever its conditions, it is clear in any case that the provisional revolutionary government cannot help relying on certain classes. It is enough to recall this elementary fact to see that the provisional revolutionary government can be nothing other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Therefore, the distinction which *Iskra* makes is only dragging the party backwards into fruitless quarrels over mere words, and away from the task of concretely analysing the class interests in the Russian Revolution.

Or take another argument of *Iskra*. Apropos of the slogan, " Long live the revolutionary provisional government ! " it remarks in an edifying tone, " The combination of the words ' long live ' and ' government ' befouls the mouth." But is that not an empty-sounding phrase ? They talk of overthrowing the autocracy and at the same time are afraid of befouling themselves by welcoming the provisional revolutionary government ! It is surprising, indeed, that they are not afraid of befouling themselves by welcoming the republic : but a republic necessarily presupposes a government, and not a single Social-Democrat has ever doubted that it meant precisely a bourgeois government. What is the distinction between welcoming the provisional revolutionary government and the welcoming of the democratic republic ? Must Social-Democracy, the political leader of the most revolutionary class, resemble an anæmic and hysterical old

* Tailism

III. THREE CONSTITUTIONS OR THREE TYPES OF STATE

What do the police and the officials want?	What do the most liberal bourgeois (*Osvobozhdeniye* Group or the Constitutional-Democratic Party)* want?	What do the class-conscious workers (the Social-Democrats) want?
—Absolute monarchy.	—Constitutional monarchy.	—Democratic republic.

WHAT ARE THESE TYPES OF STATE?

Absolute Monarchy.	*Constitutional Monarchy.*	*Democratic Republic.*
1. The Tsar an absolute monarch.	1. The Tsar a constitutional monarch.	1. No Tsar at all.
2. State Council (of officials appointed by the Tsar).	2. An upper house of people's representatives (indirect, not altogether equal and not altogether universal suffrage).	2. No upper house.
3. A State Duma or an advisory chamber of people's delegates (indirect, unequal, and not universal suffrage).	3. A lower house (universal, direct, and equal suffrage with secret ballot).	3. A single republican chamber (universal, direct, and equal suffrage with secret ballot).

* *Osvobozhdeniye* (*Emancipation*), a bourgeois-liberal paper. The group which centred around this paper developed into the "Emancipation Group" and from this into the Constitutional-Democratic Party—"Cadets" for short (from the abbreviation C.-D.).—*Ed.*

WHAT DO THESE TYPES OF STATE MEAN ?

Absolute Monarchy.	*Constitutional Monarchy.*	*Democratic Republic.*
1. The whole power to the police and the officials over the people.	1. One-third of power to the police and the officials, with the Tsar at their head.	1. No independent power to the police and the officials; their complete subordination to the people.
2. The big bourgeoisie and the rich landowner act in an advisory capacity.	2. One-third of power to the big bourgeoisie and the rich landowners.	2. No privileges to either the capitalists or the landowners.
3. No power to the people.	3. One-third of power to the whole people.	3. The whole power, sole, complete, and unlimited, to the whole people.

WHAT ENDS DO THESE TYPES OF STATE SERVE ?

Absolute Monarchy.	*Constitutional Monarchy.*	*Democratic Republic.*
To assure the well-being of the nobility, the police and the officials. To permit the rich to rob the workers and peasants at will. To keep the people for ever without rights, in ignorance and darkness.	To put the police and the officials at the beck and call of the capitalists and landowners. To enable the capitalists, landowners and rich farmers to exploit the workers of town and country freely and undisturbedly, not arbitrarily, but according to the law.	To enable a free and enlightened people to learn how to govern themselves, and above all to enable the working class to fight for Socialism, under which there will be neither rich nor poor, and under which all the land and the factories and works will belong to all the workers.

(Published as a leaflet, July 7, 1905.)

maid, finickally insisting on the necessity of the fig-leaf: one may welcome that which presupposes a bourgeois democratic government, but may not directly welcome the provisional revolutionary democratic government?

Picture: the insurrection of the St. Petersburg workers has won. The autocracy has been overthrown. The provisional revolutionary government has been proclaimed. The armed workers are exulting to cries of "Long live the provisional revolutionary government!" To one side stand the new *Iskra* group and, raising on high their virtuous eyes, beating themselves on their delicately moral breasts, utter the words: "We thank Thee, oh Lord, that we are not like these publicans, that we have not befouled our mouths with such combinations of words. . . ."

No, a thousand times no, comrades! Do not fear to befoul yourselves by the most energetic, ruthless participation, side by side with revolutionary bourgeois democracy, in the republican revolution. Don't exaggerate the dangers of such participation; our organised proletariat is quite able to take care of them. Months of revolutionary dictatorship by the proletariat and peasantry will do more than decades of the peaceful, stupefying atmosphere of political stagnation. If the Russian working class, after the 9th of January, was able to mobilise, under conditions of political slavery, more than a million proletarians for a collective, resolute and stubborn attack, then, under the conditions of revolutionary democratic dictatorship, we shall mobilise tens of millions of the poor class in city and country, we shall make the Russian political revolution the prologue of the European Socialist revolution.

(*Vperyod*, No. 14, April 12, 1905.)

IV

THE FIRST VICTORY OF THE REVOLUTION

GENEVA.
November 1.

LATE on Monday night the telegraph brought Europe the news of the Tsar's manifesto of October 30.* The *Times* correspondent wired: "The people is victorious. The Tsar has capitulated. Autocracy has ceased to exist." Friends of the Russian Revolution living in distant Baltimore (U.S.A.) expressed themselves differently in a cable they sent to the *Proletary* †: "Congratulations on the first great victory of the Russian Revolution."

The last-mentioned estimation of the events is undoubtedly far more accurate. We have every reason to be jubilant. The Tsar's confession is indeed a great victory for the revolution, but this victory does not by a long way settle the fate of the whole cause of freedom. The Tsar is still far from capitulating. Autocracy has not at all ceased to exist. It has only retreated, leaving the field of battle to the enemy; it retreated after an exceedingly important battle, but it has not by any means been defeated; it is rallying its forces, and the revolutionary people will have many serious fighting problems to solve before the revolution is brought to a real and complete victory.

October 30 will go down in history as one of the great days of the Russian Revolution. The strike of a whole people,‡ unparalleled anywhere in the world, reached its zenith. The mighty hand of the proletariat, raised in a sweep of heroic solidarity over the whole of Russia, has brought the whole industrial, commercial and governmental life of the country to a standstill. A great calm hung over the country, the calm before the storm. From city after city reports came, each more alarming than the rest. The army was wavering. The government was refraining from repressions, the revolutionaries were not commencing serious open attacks, but a spontaneous uprising was breaking out everywhere.

At the last minute the Tsarist government yielded, for it realised

* This manifesto, forced from the Tsar by the revolution, promised among other things, "to grant the population civil liberties on the firm basis of freedom of individual, conscience, speech, assembly, and association"; "the further extension of the principle of universal suffrage" to the already promised Imperial Duma, and the "firm principle that no law can become effective without the approval of the Imperial Duma."—*Ed.*

† *Proletary* (*Proletarian*), Bolshevik Central Organ of the party, was founded in May, 1905, and appeared until November of the same year.—*Ed.*

‡ The general strike in the second half of October, 1905, affected almost all the industrial workers of Russia, stopped all the railroads, and even the government employees, students, shop clerks, lawyers, etc., joined it.—*Ed.*

that an explosion was inevitable, that it was no longer able to achieve complete victory, that on the contrary it stood the risk of suffering complete defeat. Trepov* is reported to have said, " First there will be bloodshed; then a Constitution." There could be no doubt already as to the inevitability of a Constitution, even if the uprising were suppressed. And the government decided that it was better not to risk serious and general bloodshed, for if the people were victorious, the Tsar's power would have been altogether swept away.

We have only an infinitesimal part of the information which was in the government's possession on Monday, October 30, and which induced it to avoid a desperate battle and to yield. All the efforts of local and central authorities were directed towards holding up the information about the formidable growth of the uprising, or at least towards curtailing it. However, even the scanty, casual, fragmentary news which reached the European press leaves no doubt that this was a real uprising, which instilled mortal terror into the hearts of the Tsar and his ministers.

The forces of Tsarism and of the revolution have become equally balanced, we wrote a week ago on the ground of the first news of the all-Russian political strike. Tsarism is no longer strong enough to crush the revolution. Revolution is not yet strong enough to crush Tsarism. But when there is such equilibrium of forces, every delay means the greatest danger to Tsarism, for a delay is inevitably bound to cause wavering among the troops.

The uprising spread. Blood was already being shed in all parts of Russia. The people were fighting on the barricades from Reval to Odessa, from Poland to Siberia. The troops were victorious in isolated small encounters, but at the same time news was arriving about a new phenomenon, hitherto unheard-of, which clearly revealed the *military* impotence of the autocracy. This was the news of *negotiations* between the Tsar's troops and the people in revolt (in Kharkov), the news of the *withdrawal* of troops from cities (Kharkov, Reval) as the *only* way to restore order. Negotiations with the people in revolt, the withdrawal of troops—this is the beginning of the end. This proves better than any argument that the military authorities realised that their position was exceedingly precarious. This shows that disaffection among the troops had reached a truly terrifying extent. Isolated news and rumours also reached the foreign press.

* Trepov (1855-1906), later Assistant Minister of the Interior, was at that time Chief of Police in Moscow. He was an inspirer of Black Hundred pogroms and author of the expression, " Spare no cartridges."—*Ed.*

In Kiev they arrested soldiers who refused to shoot. Similar cases occurred in Poland. In Odessa the infantry was confined to the barracks, because the authorities were afraid to bring them into the streets. In St. Petersburg ferment was obviously beginning to manifest itself in the navy and it was reported that the regiments of the Guards were altogether unreliable. There has been no means of learning the truth in regard to the Black Sea Fleet.

But on October 30, telegrams reported that the rumours of another mutiny in this fleet were very persistent, that all wires were being intercepted by the authorities, who had done their utmost to prevent reports of these events from spreading.

In putting these fragments of news together, we cannot but come to the conclusion that the position of the autocracy, even from a purely military standpoint, was desperate. It was still suppressing isolated outbursts, its troops were still taking barricades here and there, but these isolated encounters only inflamed passions, only increased the disaffection, only brought nearer a stronger general explosion, which the government particularly feared, for it could no longer rely on the army.

The enemy avoided a serious battle. The enemy retreated, leaving the field of battle to the revolutionary people—he has retreated to a new position, which, in his opinion, is more strongly fortified, where he counts on gathering his more reliable forces, to weld them together, to encourage them and to choose the best moment for attack.

A whole series of relatively "impartial" reports in the European bourgeois press confirms this estimation of the great day of October 30.

On the one hand the European bourgeoisie emits a sigh of relief. The Tsar's manifesto promises a real Constitution, the Duma is invested with legislative powers, not a single law may become effective without the approval of the people's representatives, responsible government is granted. Moreover, civil liberties, inviolability of the individual, freedom of conscience, of speech, of assembly, of association, are granted. And the Stock Exchange hastens to express its great confidence in Russian finances. Russian securities, which for the last few days had been dropping, are now going up. Foreign bankers, who fled from revolutionary St. Petersburg, promise to come back in a fortnight. The European bourgeoisie regard the Constitution as a pledge of "peaceful" minor concessions, which will entirely satisfy the propertied classes, without at the same time allowing the revolutionary proletariat to acquire "too much" freedom.

But on the other hand, even the liberal bourgeoisie cannot fail to see that the Tsar's manifesto contains only empty words, mere promises. Who nowadays will trust mere promises? Aren't all those phrases about inviolability of the individual and the freedom of speech mere mockery, at a time when the prisons are still filled with so-called political criminals, when the censorship is still in operation? Who will carry out the Tsar's promise? The Witte cabinet, which is rumoured to include Kuzmin-Karavayev, Kosych, Koni?* This will not even be a cabinet of the liberal bourgeoisie. This will only be a cabinet of the liberal *Bureaucracy*, which has been often defeated by the reactionary Court clique. Did the people shed its blood in the struggle for freedom only to place reliance on the liberal bureaucrats, who are confining themselves to mere words and promises?

No! Tsarism is far from capitulating. Autocracy has not yet fallen by a long way. The revolutionary proletariat will still have to face a series of great battles, and the first victory will help it to consolidate its forces and enlist new allies in that struggle.

On the very day the Manifesto was proclaimed the *Times* correspondent wrote:

> "The very success of the cause of liberty will only urge the reactionary elements to new activity and so long as the army remains under the power of the old rulers, Russia cannot be safe from the possibility of a PRONUNCIAMENTO. . . . It remains to be seen whether the forced concession of the Government at the time when the revolution was at its height will not serve as a signal for a new effort on the part of the revolution. . . . It is not known whether bureaucracy has been ousted from its stronghold or whether it has merely retreated from its forward positions."

This is what the bourgeois optimists say, although the facts clearly prove that the "stronghold" of autocracy is entirely intact.

The forced nature of the concession disturbs the moderate bourgeois most. The organ of the French ruling moneybag, the *Temps*, was terribly indignant at the "anarchy," and spouted abuse and slander against the organisers of and participators in the all-Russian political

* Witte (1849-1915), previously Minister of Finance, Prime Minister in 1905, was the author of the Tsar's Manifesto of October 30, 1905 (see p. 23, n.). After the revolution had been crushed, he disappeared from the political scene. Kuzmin-Karavayev was a moderate liberal. Kosych was a liberal bureaucrat, member of the Imperial Duma. Koni was a professor of criminal law; he was president of the court which acquitted Vera Zasulich (1878), after which trial he was removed from his post.—*Ed.*

strike. Now, however, this paper, though satisfied with the Tsar's constitutional promises as such, remarks with concern:

> "Instead of acting on his own initiative, the Tsar simply signed the 'instructions' of the liberal opposition. This is a bad method which gives all the subsequent reforms a forced character, a character of something fragmentary and sudden. This method places the government in contradiction with itself and sets a premium on violence. Unfortunately, it is all too clear that things had gone really very far and that there was no way out of the *impasse* into which the government had been driven. Let us therefore forget as soon as possible the character of this capitulation—a capitulation not only before the constitutionalists, who are moderate people, who ought to be listened to above all, but a capitulation before a strike, a capitulation before the revolution."

No honourable bourgeois, the workers will never forget the forced character of the Tsar's capitulation! The workers will never forget that only by force, the force of their organisation, their unanimity, their mass heroism, did they wrest from Tsarism the recognition of freedom in a scrap of paper called a manifesto, and will wrest freedom in reality.

We stated above that the enemy has retreated, leaving the field of battle to the revolutionary proletariat. We must add now: the retreating enemy is being energetically pursued. On Monday, October 30, the Tsar's manifesto was published. On Tuesday, October 31, we are informed by the Wolff Agency, a manifesto of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party was issued in St. Petersburg in a huge number of copies. This manifesto declared that the struggle of the proletariat would in no way cease as a result of the Tsar's manifesto. The tactics of the proletariat must be to make use of the rights which were granted under the pressure of blows, by arranging workers' meetings to decide the question of the continuation of the strike, by organising a militia for the protection of revolutionary rights, by presenting demands for full amnesty. The Social-Democratic speakers at popular gatherings insisted on the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. The Strike Committee, according to telegrams, demanded full amnesty and the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal and direct suffrage.

This revolutionary instinct at once prompted the workers of St.

Petersburg to adopt the right slogan: energetic continuation of the struggle, utilisation of the newly won positions to continue the onslaught so as utterly to destroy autocracy. And the struggle is going on. Meetings are being held more frequently and attendances are increasing. Joy and legitimate pride caused by the first victory do not prevent a new organisation of forces in order to carry the revolution to the end. Its success depends on winning over to the side of liberty still broader strata of the people, on their being enlightened and organised. The working class has proved its gigantic power by the all-Russian political strike, but much work still remains to be done among the backward strata of the town proletariat. While creating a workers' militia—the only reliable bulwark of the revolution—while preparing ourselves for a new and a more decisive struggle, and while maintaining our old slogans, we must turn our special attention also to the army. It is precisely in the ranks of the army that the forced concession of the Tsar must have produced the greatest vacillations, and now by attracting the soldiers to workers' meetings, by increasing the agitation in the barracks, by extending the connections with the officers, we must create along with the revolutionary army of the workers the cadres of class-conscious revolutionaries in the army as well, that army which only the other day was exclusively Tsarist and which is now on the eve of being transformed into a people's army.

The revolutionary proletariat contrived to neutralise the army, to paralyse it in the great days of the general strike. It must now strive to win over the army completely to the side of the people.

The revolutionary proletariat brought about the first great victory of the urban revolution. It must now widen and deepen the foundation of the revolution by extending it to the country. To rouse the peasantry so that they may become conscious defenders of the cause of liberty, to demand substantial measures for the benefit of the peasants, to prepare the peasants' movement, which in conjunction with the progressive town proletariat will finally destroy autocracy and win complete and real liberty—this is the next task of Russian Social-Democracy.

The success of the revolution depends on the size of those masses of the proletariat and the peasantry which will rise to defend it and see it through. Revolutionary war differs from other wars in that it draws its main reserves from the camp of the quondam allies of its enemy, the quondam supporters of Tsarism or of people who blindly followed Tsarism. And the success of the all-Russian political

strike will be of greater significance to the minds and hearts of the peasant, than the confusing words of any manifestos and laws.

The Russian Revolution just started to develop when the whole front foreground of the political stage was occupied by the liberal bourgeoisie, as was the case a year ago.

The revolution asserted itself when the urban working class commenced action on January 22.

The revolution gained its first victory when the proletariat of all the nations of Russia rose as one man and shook the Tsar's throne, a throne which has caused such incalculable misfortunes to all nations, and most of all to the toiling classes of all nations.

The revolution will finally crush the enemy, and will sweep the throne of the bloody Tsar from the face of the earth, when the workers rise once more and lead the peasantry as well.

And then—then the Russian Revolution will have other reserves. The times are gone when nations and states could live isolatedly from one another. Look: Europe has already become restless. Its bourgeoisie is troubled and is prepared to give millions and billions to stop the conflagration in Russia. The rulers of the military European powers are thinking of rendering military aid to the Tsar. Wilhelm has already sent several cruisers and two squadrons of torpedo boats to establish direct connections between the German soldiery and Peterhof. The European counter-revolution is extending its hand to the Russian counter-revolution.

Just try, Citizen Hohenzollern! We also have a European reserve for the Russian Revolution. This reserve is the international Socialist proletariat, international revolutionary Social-Democracy. The workers of the entire world greet the victory of the Russian workers with tremendous enthusiasm, and, conscious of the close ties that exist between the detachments of the international army of Socialism, are also preparing for a great and decisive struggle.

You are not alone, peasants and workers of all Russia! If you succeed in overthrowing, finally defeating and destroying the tyrants of serf-owning, police-ridden, landowners' the Tsarist Russia, your victory will serve as a signal for a world struggle against the tyranny of capital, a struggle for the complete—not only political but also economic—emancipation of the toilers, a signal for a struggle for the deliverance of humanity from poverty, for the realisation of Socialism.

(*Proletary*, No. 24, November 7, 1905.)

THE LESSONS OF THE MOSCOW UPRISING

THE publication of *Moscow in December*, 1905* could not have been more opportune. It is the most essential task of the workers' party to assimilate the lessons of the December uprising. Unfortunately, this book is like a barrel of honey spoiled by a spoonful of tar. The material is most interesting, although incomplete, but the conclusions are drawn in a slovenly manner and are incredibly flat. We shall deal with these conclusions on another occasion; at present we shall turn our attention to the burning political question of the day, to the lessons of the Moscow uprising.

The principal form of the December movement in Moscow was the peaceful strike and demonstrations. The overwhelming majority of the working masses actively participated only in these forms of struggle. But the December action in Moscow proved clearly that the general strike has become obsolete as an independent and principal form of struggle, that the movement is breaking through these narrow boundaries with elemental and irresistible force and engendering a higher form of struggle, an uprising.

In declaring the strike, all the revolutionary parties, all the unions of Moscow, were conscious and even realised that it must inevitably grow into an uprising. On December 19 the Council of Workers' Deputies resolved to "strive to transform the strike into an armed uprising."† As a matter of fact, however, none of the organisations was prepared for this. Even the Coalition Council of Fighting Units‡ (on December 22) referred to an uprising as something very remote. It is quite clear that it had no hand in or control of the street-fighting that took place. The organisations did not keep pace with the growth and sweep of the movement.

The strike grew into an uprising, first and foremost under the pressure of objective conditions, created after October. The government could now no longer be taken by surprise by a general strike: it had

* A Menshevik symposium of articles, but the only collection of material on the December, 1905, uprising, that had appeared up to that time (September, 1906).—*Ed.*

† The following organisations were informed of this decision: the Moscow organisation of the Social Democratic Party, the Moscow Party Committee of the Social-Revolutionaries, and the Moscow Workers' Council.—*Ed.*

‡ There were Social-Democratic Fighting Units as well as Social-Revolutionary units in the University, the printing shops, and one "Caucasian defence" group. But since the council had no members with military experience, it was not always at the head of events.—*Ed.*

already organised counter-revolution, it was ready for military action. The general course of the Russian Revolution after October and the sequence of events in Moscow in the December days, have supplied striking proof of one of the most profound postulates of Marx: revolution progresses by creating a compact and strong counter-revolution, *i.e.*, it compels the enemy to resort to more and more extreme measures of defence and in this way devises more powerful means of attack.

The 20th and 21st of December: a peaceful strike, peaceful mass demonstrations. The evening of the 21st: the siege of the Aquarium.* The morning of the 22nd: the crowd of Strastnaya Square is attacked by the dragoons. In the evening: the house of Fiedler is wrecked. Temper rises. The unorganised street crowds absolutely spontaneously, but hesitatingly, set up the first barricades.

The 23rd: artillery fire is opened on the barricades and on the crowds in the streets. Barricades are set up more deliberately and no longer singly, but on a really mass scale. The whole population is in the streets; all the principal centres of the city are covered by a network of barricades. For several days stubborn guerrilla fighting proceeds between the insurgent detachments and the troops. The troops become exhausted and Dubasov† is obliged to beg for reinforcements. Only on December 28 did the government forces acquire complete superiority and on December 20 the Semenov regiment stormed the Presnya District, the last stronghold of the uprising.

From strike and demonstrations to isolated barricades. From isolated barricades to a mass erection of barricades and street fighting against the troops. Over the heads of the organisations the mass proletarian struggle passed from a strike to an uprising. This is the greatest historical achievement of the Russian Revolution, and like all previous achievements, it was obtained at the price of enormous sacrifices. The movement was raised from a general political strike to a higher level. It compelled reaction to go to extremes in its resistance and so brought nearer the moment when the revolution will also go to extremes in the application of methods of attack. The reaction cannot do more than bombard barricades, houses and street crowds. But the revolution can develop on a scale ever so much greater than the battle of Moscow fighting units, it can grow ever so much wider and deeper. And the revolution has made great progress

* A Moscow open-air restaurant.—*Ed.*

† The military Governor-General of Moscow.—*Ed.*

since December. The base of the revolutionary crisis has become immeasurably broader;—the blade must now be sharpened to a keener edge.

The proletariat sensed sooner than its leaders the change in the objective conditions of the struggle which demanded the transition from the strike to an uprising. As is always the case, practice went ahead of theory. A peaceful strike and demonstrations almost at one stroke ceased to satisfy the workers; they asked: what is to be done next? and demanded more resolute action. The instructions to set up barricades reached the districts exceedingly late, when barricades were already being erected in the centre. The mass of the workers set to work, but were not satisfied even with this; they demanded to know: what is to be done next?—they demanded active measures. In December, 1905, we, the leaders of the Social-Democratic proletariat, behaved like the commander-in-chief who arranged the disposition of his troops in such an absurd way that most of them remained out of action. The masses of the workers demanded, but failed to obtain instructions for resolute mass action. Consequently, nothing could be more shortsighted than Plekhanov's view, which is adopted by all the opportunists, that the strike was inopportune and should not have been started and that they "should not have taken up arms." On the contrary, they should have taken to arms more resolutely, energetically and aggressively, it should have been explained to the masses that peaceful strikes by themselves were useless, and that fearless and ruthless armed fighting was required. The time has come when we must at last openly and publicly admit that political strikes are insufficient, we must carry on the widest agitation among the masses in favour of an armed uprising and make no attempt to conceal this question by any "preliminary stages," or by throwing a veil over it. To conceal from the masses the necessity for a desperate, sanguinary, exterminating war as the immediate task of future revolutionary action—means to deceive both ourselves and the people.

This is the first lesson of the December events. The other lesson refers to the character of the uprising, the methods by which it is carried out and the conditions under which the troops come over to the side of the people. In the Right Wing of our party an extremely one-sided view prevails on this matter. It is alleged that it is impossible to fight modern troops, that the troops must first become revolutionary. Of course, unless the revolution assumes a mass

character and affects also the troops, serious fighting is out of the question. Work among the troops is of course necessary. But we must not imagine that the troops will come over to our side at one stroke, as it were, as the result of persuasion or their own conviction. The Moscow uprising clearly demonstrated how stereotyped and lifeless is this view. As a matter of fact, the wavering of the troops, which is inevitable in every really popular movement, leads to a real fight for the troops whenever the revolutionary struggle becomes more acute.

The Moscow uprising presented an example of the desperate, frantic struggle for the troops that takes place between the reaction and the revolution. Dubasov himself declared that only five out of the fifteen thousand men of the Moscow garrison were reliable. The Government restrained the waverers by most varied and most desperate measures: they were appealed to, flattered, bribed, presented with watches, money, etc.; they were intoxicated with vodka, they were lied to, they were threatened, they were locked up in the barracks and disarmed; and those soldiers who were suspected of being least reliable were removed by treachery and violence.

We must have the courage to confess openly and unreservedly that in this respect we lagged behind the Government. We failed to utilise the forces at our disposal for a similar active, bold, enterprising and aggressive fight for the wavering troops, as was carried on and carried through by the Government. We have been carrying on work in the army in the past, but we must redouble our efforts in the future to "convert" the army ideologically. But we shall prove to be miserable pedants if we forget that at the moment of the uprising a physical fight for the army is also necessary.

The Moscow proletariat in the December days gave us magnificent lessons in the art of ideologically "converting" the troops, as for example, on December 21 on Strastnaya Square, when the crowd surrounded the Cossacks, mingled and fraternised with them and persuaded them to ride away. Or on December 23 in the Presnya district when two working girls carrying a red flag in a crowd of 10,000 people, rushed towards the Cossacks and cried: "Kill us! We shall not surrender this flag as long as we are alive." And the Cossacks were disconcerted and galloped away, followed by the shouts of the crowd: "Long live the Cossacks." Such instances of courage and heroism must live for ever in the memory of the proletariat.

But here are some instances of how we lagged behind Dubasov.

On December 22 some soldiers singing the "Marseillaise" were marching down the Bolshaya Serpukhovskaya Street to join the insurgents. The workers sent delegates to meet them. Malakhov* himself galloped at break-neck speed towards them. The workers were too late, Malakhov reached them first. He delivered a passionate speech, shook the resolution of the soldiers, surrounded them with dragoons, marched them off to the barracks and locked them in. Malakhov reached the soldiers before we did, although within two days 150,000 men rose at our call and these could and should have organised the patrolling of the streets. Malakhov surrounded the soldiers with dragoons, whereas we failed to surround the Malakhovs with bomb-throwers. We could, and should, have done this, as the Social-Democratic press (the old *Iskra*) long ago pointed out that it is our duty in time of an uprising to exterminate ruthlessly all the chiefs of the civil and military authorities. What took place on the Bolshaya Serpukhovskaya Street was repeated apparently in front of the Nesvizhsky and Krutitsky barracks, when attempts were also made by the workers to "remove" the Yekaterinoslav regiment, and when delegates were sent to the sappers in Alexandrov† and when the Rostov artillery on its way to Moscow was turned back, and when the sappers were disarmed in Kolomna,‡ etc. At the moment of the uprising we were not equal to our task in the fight for the wavering troops.

December confirmed another profound postulate of Marx, which the opportunists have forgotten, namely, that rebellion is an art, and that the principal rule of this art is a desperately bold and irrevocably determined offensive.§ We have not sufficiently assimilated this truth. We have not sufficiently learned, nor have we taught the masses this art and this rule to attack at all costs. We must make up for this with all our energy. It is not enough to rally round political slogans, we must also rally round the question of an armed uprising. Whoever is against it, whoever is not preparing himself for it—must be ruthlessly cast out of the ranks of the supporters of the revolution, and sent back to the ranks of its enemies, of the traitors or cowards, for the day is approaching when the force of events and the conditions of the struggle will compel us to divide enemies and friends according to that principle. We must not preach passivity, nor advocate "waiting" until the troops "come over." No! We must proclaim

* Staff commander during the Moscow military crisis.—*Ed.*
† A small town in the province of Vladimir, 70 miles north of Moscow.—*Ed.*
‡ A small town in the province of Moscow.—*Ed.*
§ From Engels' *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany.*—*Ed.*

from the housetops the necessity of a bold offensive and armed attack, the necessity of exterminating at such times the persons in command of the enemy and of a most energetic fight for the wavering troops.

The third great lesson provided by Moscow refers to tactics and the organisation of forces for the uprising. Military tactics depend on the level of military technique. This plain truth was dinned into the ears of Marxists by Engels. Military technique now is not the same as it was in the middle of the nineteenth century. It would be folly for crowds to contend against artillery and defend barricades with revolvers. And Kautsky was right when he wrote that it was high time now, after Moscow, to revise the conclusions of Engels, and that Moscow had inaugurated "*new barricade tactics.*"* These tactics were the tactics of guerrilla warfare. The organisation which such tactics demanded is that of mobile and exceedingly small detachments: ten-, three-, or even two-men detachments. We often meet Social-Democrats who chuckle whenever the five- and three-men detachments are mentioned. But chuckling is only a cheap way of ignoring the *new* question of tactics and organisation called forth by street fighting under the conditions imposed by modern military technique. Study carefully the story of the Moscow uprising, gentlemen, and you will understand what connection exists between "five-men detachments" and the question of "new barricade tactics."

Moscow advanced these tactics but failed by far to develop them, to apply them to any considerable extent, to a really mass extent. Detachments were few in numbers, the working masses were not given the slogan of bold attack and did not apply it, the character of the guerrilla detachments was too varied, their arms and methods were inadequate, their ability to lead the crowd was practically undeveloped. We must make up for all this and we shall do so by learning from the experience of Moscow, by spreading it among the masses, and by arousing their creative efforts for the further development of that experience. And precisely that guerrilla warfare and mass terror which has been going on in Russia everywhere and almost continuously since December will undoubtedly help the masses to learn the correct tactics to be applied at the time of an uprising. Social-Democracy must recognise and incorporate this mass terror

* From an article by Kautsky in the Berlin *Vorwarts*, January 28, 1906. He meant by this Engels' preface to the German 1895 edition of Marx's *Class Struggles in France*, but this, as has been proven, was revised in an opportunist sense by the E.C. of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany without Engels' knowledge.—*Ed.*

into its tactics, organising and controlling it, of course, subordinating it to the interests and conditions of the labour movement and the general revolutionary struggle, while eliminating and doing away ruthlessly with the "bosyak"* perversion of this guerrilla warfare which were so magnificently and ruthlessly suppressed by our Moscow comrades in the days of the uprising and by the Letts in the days of the notorious Lettish republics.

Military technique has recently made new progress. The Japanese war produced the hand grenade. The arms factories have placed on the market automatic rifles. Both these weapons are already being successfully used in the Russian Revolution, but to an inadequate extent. We can and must take advantage of improvements in technique, teach the workers' detachments to make bombs in large quantities, we must help them and our fighting detachments to obtain supplies of explosives, fuses and automatic rifles. If the masses of the workers take part in uprisings in the towns, if mass attacks are made upon the enemy, if a determined, skilful fight is waged for the troops, who after the Duma, after Sveaborg and Kronstadt are wavering still more, and the participation of the villages in the general struggle secured—victory will be ours in the next all-Russian armed uprising!

Let us then more extensively develop our work and more boldly set our tasks, while assimilating the lessons of the great days of the Russian Revolution. The basis of our work is the correct estimate of the class interests and the requirements of the national development at the present moment. Around the slogan of "the overthrow of the Tsarist government and the convocation by a revolutionary government of the constituent assembly", we are rallying and will continue to rally an increasingly large section of the proletariat, the peasantry and the army. The development of the consciousness of the masses remains, as always, the basis and the principal content of our work. But let us not forget that in addition to this general, constant and fundamental task, times, like those Russia is now living through are imposing other and special tasks. Let us not become pedants and philistines, let us not evade these special tasks of the moment, these special tasks of the given forms of struggle, by meaningless references to our permanent duties which are immutable, irrespective of time and circumstances.

Let us remember that the great mass struggle is approaching. This will be an armed uprising. It must, as far as possible, be

* Tramp, or slum elements.—*Ed.*

simultaneous. The masses must know that they are entering upon an armed, sanguinary and desperate struggle. Contempt for death must spread among the masses and thus secure victory. The offensive against the enemy must be most energetic; attack and not defence must become the slogan of the masses; the ruthless extermination of the enemy will be their task; the organisation of the struggle will become mobile and flexible; the wavering elements of the troops will be drawn into the active struggle. The party of the class-conscious proletariat must do its duty in this great struggle.

(*Proletary*, No. 2, September 11, 1906.)

VI

LECTURE ON THE 1905 REVOLUTION*

My Young Friends and Comrades,

To-day is the twelfth anniversary of " Bloody Sunday," which is rightly regarded as the beginning of the Russian Revolution.

Thousands of workers—not Social-Democrats, but faithful, loyal people—led by the priest Gapon, stream from all parts of the city to the centre of the capital, to the square in front of the Winter Palace, in order to submit a petition to the Tsar. The workers carry ikons, and their leader, in a letter to the Tsar, has guaranteed his personal safety and asked him to appear before the people.

Troops are called out. Uhlans and Cossacks hurl themselves against the crowd with drawn swords. They fire on the unarmed workers, who on their bended knees implore the Cossacks to let them go to the Tsar. On that day, according to police reports, more than 1,000 were killed and more than 2,000 were wounded. The indignation of the workers was indescribable.

Such is the bare outline of what took place on January 22, 1905, " Bloody Sunday."

In order that you may understand more clearly the significance of this event, I will quote to you a few passages from the workers' petition. The petition begins with the following words:

* Delivered on January 22, 1917, before a gathering of working-class youths in Zurich.—*Ed.*

> "We workers, inhabitants of St. Petersburg, have come to Thee. We are unfortunate, reviled slaves. We are crushed by despotism and tyranny. At last, when our patience was exhausted, we ceased work and begged our masters to give us only that without which life is a torture. But this was refused. Everything seemed unlawful to the employers. We here, many thousands of us, like the whole of the Russian people, have no human rights whatever. Owing to the deeds of Thine officials we have become slaves."

The petition enumerates the following demands: amnesty, civic liberty, normal wages, the land to be gradually transferred to the people, convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal and equal suffrage; and it ends with the following words: "Sire, do not refuse aid to Thy people! Throw down the wall that separates Thee from Thy people. Order and swear that our requests will be granted, and Thou wilt make Russia happy; if not, we are ready to die on this very spot. We have only two roads: freedom and happiness, or the grave."

Reading it *now*, this petition of uneducated, illiterate workers, led by a patriarchal priest, creates a strange impression. Involuntarily one compares this naive petition with the peaceful resolutions passed to-day by the social-pacifists, *i.e.*, who claim to be Socialists, but who, in reality are bourgeois phrase-mongers. The unenlightened workers of pre-revolutionary Russia did not know that the Tsar was the head of the *ruling class*, namely, the class of large landowners, who by a thousand ties, were already bound up with a big bourgeoisie who were ready to defend their monopoly, privileges and profits by every violent means. The social-pacifists of to-day, who—without jesting—pretend to be "highly educated" people, do not realise that it is just as foolish to expect a "democratic" peace from the bourgeois governments, which are waging an imperialist predatory war, as it was foolish to think that the bloody Tsar could be induced to grant reforms by peaceful petitions.

Nevertheless, the great difference between the two is that the present-day social-pacifists are, to a large extent hypocrites, who, by mild suggestions, strive to divert the people from the revolutionary struggle, whereas the unenlightened workers in pre-revolutionary Russia proved by their deeds that they were straightforward people who, for the first time, had awakened to political consciousness.

It is this awakening of tremendous masses of the people to political consciousness and revolutionary struggle that marks the historic significance of January 22, 1905.

"There is not yet a revolutionary people in Russia," said Mr. Peter Struve,* then leader of the Russian liberals, and publisher abroad of an illegal, free organ—*two days before* "*Bloody Sunday.*" To this "highly educated," supercilious and extremely stupid leader of the bourgeois reformists the idea that an illiterate peasant country could give birth to a revolutionary people seemed utterly absurd. The reformists of those days—like the reformists of to-day—were profoundly convinced that a real revolution was impossible!

Prior to January 22 (January 9, old style), 1905, the revolutionary party of Russia consisted of a small handful of people, and the reformists of those days (like the reformists of to-day) derisively called them a "sect." Several hundred revolutionary organisers, several thousand members of local organisations, half a dozen revolutionary papers appearing not more frequently than once a month, published mainly abroad, and smuggled into Russia under extraordinary difficulties and at the price of many sacrifices—such were the revolutionary parties in Russia, and revolutionary Social-Democracy in particular, prior to January 22, 1905. This circumstance gave the narrow-minded and overbearing reformists a formal justification for asserting that there was not yet a revolutionary people in Russia.

Within a few months, however, the picture completely changed. The hundreds of revolutionary Social-Democrats "suddenly" grew into thousands; the thousands became leaders of between two and three millions of proletarians. The proletarian struggle gave rise to a strong ferment, often to revolutionary movements, among the peasant masses, fifty to a hundred million strong; the peasant movement had its repercussion in the army and led to soldiers' uprisings, to armed clashes between one section of the army and another. In this manner, a colossal country, with a population of 130,000,000, entered into the revolution; in this way slumbering Russia became transformed into a Russia of a revolutionary proletariat and a revolutionary people.

It is necessary to study this transformation to understand its possibilities, its ways and methods, so to speak.

The principal means by which this transformation was brought

* Struve (born 1870), at first a Social-Democrat, after 1905 leader of the Right Wing of the Cadets, is now an emigré and publishes a magazine with monarchist leanings.—*Ed.*

about was the mass strike. The peculiar feature of the Russian Revolution is that in its social content it was a *bourgeois-democratic* revolution, but in its methods of struggle it was a *proletarian* revolution. It was a bourgeois-democratic revolution, since the aim toward which it strove directly and which it could reach directly, with the aid of its own forces was a democratic republic, an eight-hour day and the confiscation of the immense estates of the nobility—all measures achieved almost completely in the French bourgeois revolution in 1792 and 1793.

At the same time the Russian Revolution was also a proletarian revolution, not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also in the sense that the specifically proletarian means of struggle—namely, the strike—was the principal instrument employed for rousing the masses and the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like rise of decisive events.

The Russian Revolution is the *first*, though certainly not the last, great revolution in history, in which the mass political strike played an extraordinarily great role. It can even be asserted that it is impossible to understand the events in the Russian Revolution and the changes that took place in its political forms, unless a study is made of the *statistics of strikes*, which alone provide the clue to these events and change in form.

I know perfectly well that statistics are very dry in a lecture and are calculated to drive an audience away. Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from quoting a few figures, in order that you may be able to appreciate the objective foundation of the whole movement. The average number of persons involved in strikes in Russia during the last ten years preceding the revolution was 43,000 per annum. Consequently, the total number of persons involved in strikes during the whole decade preceding the revolution was 430,000. In January, 1905, which was the first month of the revolution, the number of persons involved in strikes was 440,000. There were more persons involved in strikes in one month than in the whole of the preceding decade!

In no capitalist country in the world—not even in advanced countries like England, the United States of America, or Germany, has such a tremendous strike movement been witnessed as that which occurred in Russia in 1905. The total number of persons involved in strikes rose to 2,800,000, twice the total number of factory workers in the country! This, of course, does not prove that the urban factory

workers of Russia were more educated, or stronger, or more adapted to the struggle than their brothers in Western Europe. The very opposite is true.

But it does prove how great the dormant energy of the proletariat can be. It shows that in a revolutionary epoch—I say this without exaggeration on the basis of the most accurate data of Russian history—the proletariat *can* develop fighting energy *a hundred times greater* than in normal, peaceful, times. It shows that up to 1905, humanity did not yet know what a great, what a tremendous exertion of effort the proletariat is capable of in a fight for really great aims, and when it fights in a really revolutionary manner!

The history of the Russian Revolution shows that it is the vanguard, the chosen elements of the wage-workers who fought with the greatest tenacity and the greatest self-sacrifice. The larger the enterprises involved, the more stubborn the strikes were and the more often they repeated themselves during that year. The bigger the city the more significant was the role the proletariat played in the struggle. In the three large cities, St. Petersburg, Riga and Warsaw, where the workers were numerous and more class-conscious, the proportion of workers involved in strikes to the total number of workers was immeasurably larger than in other cities, and, of course, much larger than in the rural districts.

The metal workers in Russia—probably the same is true also in regard to the other capitalist countries—represent the vanguard of the proletariat. In this connection we note the following instructive fact: Taking all industries combined, the number of persons involved in strikes in 1905 was 160 per hundred workers employed, but in the *metal industry* the number was 320 per hundred! It is calculated that in 1905 every Russian factory worker lost in wages in consequence of strikes, on the average ten roubles—approximately 26 francs at the pre-war rate of exchange—sacrificing this money, as it were, for the sake of the struggle. If we take the metal workers alone, we find that the loss in wages is *three times as great!* The best elements of the working class marched in the forefront of the battle, leading after them the hesitating ones, rousing the dormant and encouraging the weak.

An outstanding feature was the manner in which economic strikes were interlaced with political strikes during the revolution.

It is quite evident that only when these two forms of strikes are closely linked up with each other can the movement acquire its greatest

power. The broad masses of the exploited could not have been drawn into the revolutionary movement had they not seen examples of how the wage workers in the various branches of industry compelled the capitalists to improve their conditions. This struggle imbued the masses of the Russian people with a new spirit. Only then did the old serf-ridden, backward, patriarchal, pious and obedient Russia cast off the old Adam; only then did the Russian people obtain a really democratic and really revolutionary education.

When the bourgeois gentry and their uncritical chorus of satellites, the social-reformists, talk priggishly about the "education" of the masses, they usually mean something schoolmasterly, pedantic, something which demoralises the masses and imbues them with bourgeois prejudices.

The real education of the masses can never be separated from the independent, political, and particularly from the revolutionary struggle of the masses themselves. Only the struggle educates the exploited class. Only the struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind, forges its will; and therefore, even reactionaries have to admit that the year 1905, the year of struggle, "the mad year," definitely buried patriarchal Russia.

We will examine more closely the relation between the metal workers and the textile workers in Russia during the strike struggle of 1905. The metal workers were the best paid, the most class-conscious and the best educated proletarians. The textile workers, who in 1905 were two and a half times more numerous than the metal workers, were the most backward and the worst-paid mass of workers in Russia, who in very many cases had not yet definitely severed their connections with their peasant kinsmen in the village. In this connection a very important fact comes to light.

The metal workers' strikes in 1905 show a preponderance of political over economic strikes, although at the beginning of the year this preponderance was not so great as it was toward the end of the year. On the other hand, among the textile workers were observed a great preponderance of economic strikes at the beginning of 1905, and only at the end of the year do we get a preponderance of political strikes. From this it follows quite obviously that the economic struggle, the struggle for immediate and direct improvement of conditions, is alone capable of rousing the backward strata of the exploited masses, gives them a real education and transforms them—during a revolutionary

epoch—into an army of political fighters within the space of a few months.

Of course, for this to happen, the vanguard of the workers had to understand that the class struggle was not a struggle in the interests of a small upper stratum, as the reformists too often tried to persuade the workers to believe; the proletariat had to come forward as the real vanguard of the majority of the exploited, drawing that majority into the struggle, as was the case in Russia in 1905 and as must certainly be the case in the coming proletarian revolution in Europe.

The beginning of 1905 brought with it the first great wave of strikes throughout the entire country. Already in the spring of that year we observe the awakening of the first big, not only economic, but also political *peasant movement* in Russia. The importance of this turning-point of history will be appreciated if it is borne in mind that it was only in 1861 that the peasantry in Russia was liberated from the severest bondage of serfdom, that the majority of the peasants are illiterate, that they live in indescribable poverty, oppressed by the landlords, deluded by the priests and isolated from each other by great distances and an almost complete absence of roads.

A revolutionary movement against Tsarism arose for the first time in Russia in 1825 and that revolution was represented almost entirely by noblemen. From that moment up to 1881, when Alexander the Second was assassinated by the terrorists, the movement was led by middle class intellectuals. They displayed the greatest spirit of self-sacrifice, and they aroused the astonishment of the whole world by their heroic, terroristic methods of struggle. Those sacrifices were certainly not made in vain. They certainly contributed—directly and indirectly—to the subsequent revolutionary education of the Russian people. But they did not and could not achieve their immediate aim—to call forth a popular revolution.

This was achieved only by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Only the waves of mass strikes that swept over the whole country, coupled with the severe lessons of the imperialist Russo-Japanese war, roused the broad masses of peasants from their lethargic slumber. The word "striker" acquired an entirely new meaning among the peasants: it signified a rebel, a revolutionary, a term previously expressed by the word "student." As, however, the "student" belonged to the middle class, to the "learned," to the "gentry," he was alien to the people. On the other hand a "striker" was of the people; he belonged to the exploited class; when deported

from St. Petersburg, he often returned to the village, where he told his fellow-villagers of the conflagration that had broken out in the cities that was to destroy the capitalists and nobility. A new type appeared in the Russian village—the class-conscious young peasant. He associated with "strikers," he read newspapers, he told the peasants about events in the cities, explained to his fellow villagers the meaning of political demands and called upon them to fight against the big landowners, the priests and the government officials.

The peasants would gather in groups to discuss their conditions and gradually they were drawn into the struggle. Gathering in large crowds they attacked the big landowners, set fire to their mansions and estates and looted their stores, seized grain and other foodstuffs, killed policemen and demanded that the huge estates belonging to the nobility be transferred to the people.

In the spring of 1905, the peasant movement was only in its inception; it spread to only a minority of the counties, approximately one-seventh of the total were affected.

But the combination of the proletarian mass strikes in the cities with the peasant movement in the villages was sufficient to shake the "firmest" and last prop of Tsarism. I refer to the *Army*.

A series of *mutinies* in the navy and in the army broke out. Every fresh wave of strikes and of peasant movements during the revolution was accompanied by mutinies among the armed forces in all parts of Russia. The most well-known of these is the mutiny on the Black Sea cruiser, *Prince Potemkin*, which, after it was seized by the revolutionaries, took part in the revolution in Odessa. After the revolution was defeated, and the attempts to seize other ports (for instance, Feodosia in the Crimea) had failed, it surrendered to the Rumanian authorities in Constanza.

Permit me to relate to you in detail one little episode in the mutiny of the Black Sea Fleet, in order to give you a concrete picture of events at the apex of their development.

Gatherings of revolutionary workers and sailors were being organised more and more frequently. Since men in the armed forces were not permitted to attend workers' meetings, the workers began in masses to visit the military meetings. They gathered in thousands. The idea of joint action found a lively response. The most class-conscious companies elected deputies.

Then the military authorities decided to take action. The attempts of some of the officers to deliver "patriotic" speeches at the meetings

had failed miserably: the seamen, who were accustomed to debating, put their officers to shameful flight. After these efforts had failed, it was decided to prohibit meetings altogether. In the morning of November 24, 1905, a company of soldiers, in full war kit, was posted at the gate of the naval barracks. Rear-Admiral Pisarevsky, in a loud voice, gave the order: "Permit no one to leave the barracks! In case of disobedience, shoot!" A sailor, named Petrov, stepped forth from the ranks of the company that received that order, loaded his rifle in everybody's view, and with one shot killed Lieutenant-Colonel Stein of the Brest-Litovsk Regiment, and with another wounded Rear-Admiral Pisarevsky. The command was given: "Arrest him!" Nobody budged. Petrov threw his rifle to the ground and exclaimed: "Why don't you move? Take me!" He was arrested. The seamen, who rushed from every side, angrily demanded his release, and declared that they vouched for him. Excitement ran high.

"Petrov, the shot was an accident, wasn't it?" asked one of the officers, trying to find a way out of the situation.

"What do you mean, an accident? I stepped forward, loaded and took aim. Is that an accident?"

"They demand your release. . . ."

And Petrov was released. The seamen, however, were not content with that; all officers on duty were arrested, disarmed, and taken to company headquarters. . . . Seamen delegates, forty in number, conferred throughout the whole night. The decision was to release the officers, but never to permit them to enter the barracks again.

This little incident shows you clearly how events developed in the majority of the mutinies. The revolutionary ferment among the people could not but spread to the armed forces. It is characteristic that the leaders of the movement came from those elements in the navy and the army which had been recruited mainly from among the industrial workers and possessed most technical training, for instance, the sappers. The broad masses, however, were still too naive, their mood was too passive, too good-natured, too Christian. They flared up very quickly; any case of injustice, excessively harsh conduct on the part of the officers, bad food, etc., was enough to call forth revolt. But there was no persistence in their protest; they lacked a clear perception of aim; they lacked a clear understanding of the fact that only the most vigorous continuation of the armed struggle, only a victory over all the military and civil authorities, only the overthrow

of the government and the seizure of power throughout the whole state could guarantee the success of the revolution.

The broad masses of the seamen and soldiers light-heartedly rose in revolt. But with equal light-heartedness they foolishly released the arrested officers. They allowed themselves to be pacified by promises and persuasion on the part of their officers ; in this way the officers gained precious time, obtained reinforcements, broke the power of the rebels, and then the most brutal suppression of the movement and the execution of the leaders followed.

It is instructive to compare the mutinies in Russia in 1905 with the mutinies of the Decembrists in 1825. At that time, the leaders of the political movement belonged almost exclusively to the officer class, particularly to the officers of the nobility ; they had become infected through contact with the democratic ideas of Europe during the Napoleonic Wars. The mass of the soldiers, who at that time were still serfs, remained passive.

The history of 1905 presents a totally different picture. The mood of the officers, with few exceptions, was either bourgeois-liberal reformist, or openly counter-revolutionary. The workers and peasants in military uniform were the soul of the mutinies ; the mutinies became a movement of the people. For the first time in the history of Russia the movement spread to the majority of the exploited. But on the one hand, the masses lacked persistence and determination, they were too much afflicted with the malady of trustfulness ; on the other hand, the movement lacked an organisation of revolutionary Social-Democratic workers in military uniform. The soldiers lacked the ability to take the leadership into their own hands, to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary army, and to assume the offensive against the government authorities.

These two shortcomings—we will say in passing—will slowly, perhaps, but surely, be removed, not only by the general development of capitalism, but also by the present war.

At all events, the history of the Russian Revolution, like the history of the Paris Commune of 1871, unfailingly teaches that militarism can never, under any circumstances, be vanquished and destroyed, except by a victorious struggle of one section of the national army against the other section. It is not sufficient simply to denounce, revile and to " repudiate " militarism, to criticise and to argue that it is harmful ; it is foolish peacefully to refuse to perform military service ; the task is to keep the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat

in a state of high tension and to train its best elements, not only in a general way but concretely, so that when popular ferment reaches the higher pitch, they will put themselves at the head of the revolutionary army.

This lesson is taught us by daily experience in any capitalist state. Every " minor " crisis that such a state experiences shows us in miniature the elements and embryos of the battles which must inevitably take place on a large scale during a big crisis. What else, for instance, is a strike, if not a small crisis in capitalist society? Was not the Prussian Minister for Internal Affairs, Herr von Puttkamer, right when he uttered his famous declaration: " Every strike discloses the hydra head of revolution "? Does not the calling out of troops during strikes in all, even the most peaceful, the most " democratic "—save the mark—capitalist countries, show *how* things will work in a *really great* crisis?

But to return to the history of the Russian Revolution.

I have endeavoured to picture to you how the workers' strikes stirred the whole country and the broadest, most backward strata of the exploited, how the peasant movement began, and how it was accompanied by military uprisings.

In the autumn of 1905, the movement reached its zenith. On August 19 the Tsar issued a manifesto on the introduction of popular representation. The so-called Bulygin* Duma was to be created on the basis of a suffrage embracing a remarkably small number of electors, and this peculiar " parliament " was supposed to have, not legislative, but only *advisory* powers!

The bourgeoisie, the liberals, the opportunists, were ready to embrace wholeheartedly this " grant " of a frightened Tsar. Like all reformists, our reformists of 1905 could not understand that historic situations arise when reforms and particularly mere promises of reforms pursue *only* one aim: to allay the unrest of the people, to force the revolutionary class to cease, or at least to slacken, its struggle.

Russian revolutionary Social-Democracy perfectly understood the true nature of the grant of an illusory constitution in August, 1905. This is why, without a moment's hesitation, it issued the slogans: " Down with the advisory Duma! Boycott the Duma! Down with the Tsarist government! Continue the revolutionary struggle for the

* Bulygin (1851-1919), Minister of the Interior at the time, was removed from this position after the Tsar's Manifesto of October 30, 1905.—*Ed.*

overthrow of this government! Not the Tsar, but a provisional revolutionary government must convoke the first real popular representative assembly in Russia!"

History proved that the revolutionary Social-Democrats were right by the fact that the Bulygin Duma was never convoked. It was swept away by the revolutionary storm before it assembled; this storm forced the Tsar to promulgate a new electoral law,* which provided for an increase in the number of electors, and to recognise the legislative character of the Duma.

In October and December, 1905, the rising tide of the Russian Revolution reached its highest level. The floodgates of the revolutionary power of the people opened wider than ever before. The number of persons involved in strikes—which in January, 1905, as I have already told you, was 440,000—reached over half a million in November, 1905 (in one single month, notice!). To this number, which applies *only* to factory workers, must be added several hundreds of thousands of railway workers, postal and telegraph employees, etc.

The Russian general railroad strike stopped railway traffic and most effectively paralysed the power of the government. The doors of the universities and lecture halls which in peace-time were used only to befuddle youthful heads with pedantic professorial wisdom and to turn them into docile servants of the bourgeoisie and Tsarism, were flung wide open and served as meeting-places for thousands of workers, artisans and office workers, who openly and freely discussed political questions.

Freedom of the press was won. The censorship was simply ignored. No publisher dared send the copy to the authorities, and the authorities did not dare take any measures against this. For the first time in Russian history revolutionary papers appeared freely in St. Petersburg and other cities; in St. Petersburg alone, three daily Social-Democratic papers, with circulations ranging from 50,000 to 100,000, were published.

The proletariat marched at the head of the movement. It set out to win the eight-hour day in a revolutionary manner. The fighting slogan of the St. Petersburg proletariat was then: "*An eight-hour day and arms!*" It became obvious to the growing mass of the workers that the fate of the revolution could, and would be decided, only by an armed struggle.

In the fire of battle a peculiar mass organisation was formed, the

* The manifesto of October 30, 1905.—*Ed.*

famous *Soviets of Workers' Deputies*, meetings of delegates from all factories. In several cities in Russia these *Soviets of Workers' Deputies* began to play more and more the role of a provisional revolutionary government, the role of organs and leaders of rebellion. Attempts were made to organise Soviets of Soldiers' and Sailors' Deputies, and to combine them with the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

For a period, several cities of Russia at that time represented something in the nature of small, local "republics," the state authorities were deposed, and the Soviet of Workers' Deputies actually functioned as the new state authority. Unfortunately, these periods were all too brief, the "victories" were too weak, too isolated.

The peasant movement in the autumn of 1905 reached still greater dimensions. *Over one-third* of the counties throughout the country were affected by "peasant riots" and real peasant uprisings. The peasants burned no less than 2,000 estates and distributed among themselves the provisions that the predatory nobility had robbed from the people.

Unfortunately, this work was not done with sufficient thoroughness: unfortunately, the peasants destroyed only one-fifteenth of the total number of noblemen's estates, only one-fifteenth part of what *they should have* destroyed, in order to wipe from the face of the land of Russia the shame of large feudal landownership. Unfortunately, the peasants were too scattered, too isolated from each other in their actions; they were too unorganised, not aggressive enough, and therein lies one of the fundamental reasons for the defeat of the revolution.

Among the oppressed peoples of Russia there flared up a national movement for liberation. *Over one-half, almost three-fifths* (*to be exact*, 57 *per cent.*) of the population of Russia is subject to national oppression: they have not the right to employ their native language, and are forcibly Russified. For instance, the Mohammedans, who number tens of millions among the population of Russia, with astonishing rapidity, organised a Mohammedan League. Generally speaking, all kinds of organisations sprang up and grew at a colossal rate at that time.

To give the audience, particularly the youth, an example of how at that time the national movement for liberation rose in connection with the labour movement, I quote the following case.

In December, 1905, the children in hundreds of Polish schools burned all Russian books, pictures and portraits of the Tsar, and

attacked and drove out of the Russian schools the Russian teachers and Russian schoolmasters, shouting: "Get out of here! Go back to Russia!" The Polish pupils in the secondary schools put forward the following demands: (1) all secondary schools to be under the control of a Soviet of Workers' Deputies; (2) joint pupils' and workers' meetings to be called within the school buildings; (3) the wearing of red blouses in the secondary schools to be permitted as a token of membership in the future proletarian republic; etc.

The higher the tide of the movement rose, the more vigorously and decisively did the reaction arm to fight against the revolution. The Russian Revolution of 1905 confirmed the truth of what Karl Kautsky had written in 1902 in his book *Social Revolution* (at that time he was still a revolutionary Marxist and not a defender of social-patriots and opportunists as at present). He wrote the following:

> "The coming revolution . . . will be less like a spontaneous uprising against the government and more like a protracted *civil war*."

This is exactly what happened! This will, undoubtedly, also happen in the coming European revolution!

The hatred of Tsarism was directed particularly against the Jews. On the one hand, the Jews provided a particularly high percentage (compared with the total of the Jewish population) of leaders of the revolutionary movement. In passing, it should be said to their merit that to-day the Jews provide a relatively high percentage of representatives of internationalism compared with other nations. On the other hand, Tsarism knew perfectly well how to play up the most despicable prejudices of the most ignorant strata of the population against the Jews, in order to organise—if not to lead directly—pogroms, those atrocious massacres of peaceful Jews, their wives and children, which have roused such disgust throughout the whole civilised world. Of course, I have in mind the disgust of the truly democratic elements of the civilised world, and those are *exclusively* the Socialist workers, the proletarians.

It is calculated that in 100 cities at that time 4,000 were killed and 10,000 were mutilated. The bourgeoisie, even in the freest republican countries of Western Europe, know only too well how to combine their hypocritical phrases about "Russian atrocities" with the most shameless financial transactions, particularly with financial support

of Tsarism and with imperialist exploitation of Russia through the export of capital, etc.

The climax of the Revolution of 1905 was reached in the December uprising in Moscow. A small handful of rebels, namely, of organised and armed workers—they numbered not more than *eight thousand*—for nine days resisted the Tsarist government. The government dared not trust the Moscow garrison; on the contrary, it had to keep it behind locked doors, and only on the arrival of the Semenovsky Regiment from St. Petersburg was it able to quell the rebellion.

The bourgeoisie are pleased to describe the Moscow uprising as something artificial and throw scorn upon it. In the German, so-called "scientific" literature, for instance, Herr Professor Max Weber, in his great work on the political development of Russia, described the Moscow uprising as a "putsch." "The Lenin group," says this "highly learned" Herr Professor, "and a section of the Social-Revolutionaries had long prepared for this *senseless* uprising."

In order properly to appraise this professorial wisdom of the cowardly bourgeoisie, it is sufficient to recall the dry strike statistics. In January, 1905, there were only 13,000 persons involved in purely political strikes in Russia, whereas in October there were 330,000 and *in December the maximum was reached of* 370,000, *involved in purely political strikes*—in one month alone! Let us recall the progress of the counter-revolution, the uprisings of the peasants and the soldiers, and we will soon come to the conclusion that the dictum of bourgeois science concerning the December uprising is not only absurd, but is a subterfuge on the part of the representatives of the cowardly bourgeoisie, which sees in the proletariat its most dangerous class enemy.

In reality, the whole development of the Russian Revolution inevitably led to an armed, decisive battle between the Tsarist government and the vanguard of the class-conscious proletariat.

In my previous remarks I have already pointed out wherein lay the weakness of the Russian Revolution which led to its temporary defeat.

With the quelling of the December uprising the revolution began to subside. Even in this period, extremely interesting moments are to be observed; suffice it to recall the twofold attempt of the most militant elements of the working class to stop the retreat of the revolution and to prepare for a new offensive.

But my time has nearly expired, and I do not want to abuse the

patience of my audience. I think, however, that I have outlined the most important aspects of the revolution—its class character, its driving forces and its method of struggle—as fully as it is possible to deal with a large subject in a brief lecture.

A few brief remarks concerning the world significance of the Russian Revolution.

Geographically, economically, and historically, Russia belongs, not only to Europe, but also to Asia. This is why the Russian Revolution succeeded in finally rousing the biggest and the most backward country in Europe and in creating a revolutionary people led by a revolutionary proletariat. It achieved more than that.

The Russian Revolution gave rise to a movement throughout the whole of Asia. The revolutions in Turkey, Persia and China prove that the mighty uprising of 1905 left deep traces, and that its influence expressed in the forward movement of *hundreds and hundreds* of millions of people is ineradicable.

In an indirect way the Russian Revolution exercised influence also on the countries situated to the west. One must not forget that news of the Tsar's constitutional manifesto, reaching Vienna on October 30, 1905, played a decisive role in the final victory of universal suffrage in Austria.

A telegram bearing the news was delivered to the Congress of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, which was then assembled, just as Comrade Ellenbogen—who at that time was not yet a social-patriot but a comrade—was making his report on the political strike. This telegram was placed before him on the table. The discussion was immediately stopped. Our place is in the streets !—this was the cry that resounded in the meeting hall of the delegates of Austrian Social-Democracy. The following days witnessed monster street demonstrations in Vienna and barricades in Prague. The victory of universal suffrage in Austria was decided.

Very often we meet Western Europeans who argue about the Russian Revolution as if events, relationships, and methods of struggle in that backward country have very little resemblance to Western European relationships and, therefore, can hardly have any practical significance.

There is nothing more erroneous than such an opinion.

No doubt the forms and occasions for the impending battles in the coming European revolution will, in many respects, differ from the forms of the Russian Revolution.

Nevertheless, the Russian Revolution—precisely because of its proletarian character in that particular sense to which I referred—was the *prologue* to the coming European revolution. Undoubtedly this coming revolution can only be a proletarian revolution in the profounder sense of the word: a proletarian Socialist revolution even in its content. This coming revolution will show to an even greater degree on the one hand, that only stern battles, only civil wars, can free humanity from the yoke of capital; on the other hand, that only class-conscious proletarians can and will come forth in the role of leaders of the vast majority of the exploited.

The present grave-like stillness in Europe must not deceive us. Europe is charged with revolution. The monstrous horrors of the imperialist war, the suffering caused by the high cost of living, engender everywhere a revolutionary spirit; and the ruling classes, the bourgeoisie with its servitors, the governments, are more and more moving into a blind alley from which they can never extricate themselves without tremendous upheavals.

Just as in 1905 a popular uprising against the Tsarist government commenced under the leadership of the proletariat with the aim of achieving a democratic republic, so the coming years, precisely because of this predatory war, will lead in Europe to popular uprisings under the leadership of the proletariat against the power of finance capital, against the big banks, against the capitalists; and these upheavals cannot end otherwise than with the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, with the victory of Socialism.

We of the older generation may not live to see the decisive battles of this coming revolution. But I can certainly express the hope that the youth who are working so splendidly in the Socialist movement of Switzerland, and of the whole world, will be fortunate enough not only to fight, but also to win, in the coming proletarian revolution.

(Written in January, 1917. First published January 22, 1925 in *Pravda*, No. 18 (2949)).

VII

STAGES, TENDENCY AND PROSPECTS OF THE REVOLUTION*

1. The labour movement rouses the proletariat, which comes at once under the leadership of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and *awakens* the liberal bourgeoisie: 1895-1901-1902.

2. The labour movement passes to open political struggle and is joined by the politically awakened strata of the liberal and radical bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie: 1901-1902-1905.

3. The labour movement flares up into a direct *revolution*, while the liberal bourgeoisie has already united in a Constitutional-Democratic Party and thinks of stopping the revolution by compromising with Tsarism; but the *radical* elements of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie are inclined to enter into an alliance with the proletariat for the *continuation of the revolution*: 1905 (*especially the end of that year*).

4. The labour movement is victorious in the *democratic revolution*, the liberals temporising passively and the peasants assisting actively. To this must be added the radical republican intelligentsia and the corresponding strata of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns. The uprising of the peasants is victorious, the power of the landlords is broken.

(" The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.")

5. The liberal bourgeoisie, temporising in the third period, passive in the fourth, becomes downright counter-revolutionary, and organises itself in order to snatch from the proletariat the conquests of the revolution. Among the peasantry the whole of its well-to-do section and a good part of the middle peasantry also grows " wiser," quiets down, turns to the side of the counter-revolution, in order to wrest power from the proletariat and the village poor who sympathise with the proletariat.

6. On the basis of the relations established during the fifth period, a new crisis and a new struggle blaze forth, the proletariat is now fighting to preserve its democratic conquests for the sake of a Socialist revolution. This struggle would be almost hopeless for the Russian

* This article was found among Lenin's papers after his death.—*Ed.*

proletariat alone and its defeat would be as inevitable as the defeat of the German revolutionary party in 1849-50, or as the defeat of the French proletariat in 1871, *if the European Socialist proletariat* were not to come to the assistance of the Russian proletariat.

Thus, at this stage the liberal bourgeoisie and the well-to-do peasantry (and partly the middle peasantry) organise counter-revolution. The Russian proletariat *plus* the European proletariat organise the revolution.

Under such conditions the Russian proletariat can win a second victory. The cause is no longer hopeless. The second victory will be the *Socialist revolution in Europe.*

The European workers will show us " how to do it " and then in conjunction with them we shall bring about the Socialist revolution.

(Written at the beginning of 1906.)